



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/803,288	03/18/2004	Glenn C. Forrester	21986-00001	5657
7590	12/06/2010			
John S. Beulick Armstrong Teasdale LLP Suite 2600 One Metropolitan Square St. Louis, MO 63102				EXAMINER BATORAY, ALICIA
			ART UNIT 2441	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/06/2010	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/803,288	FORRESTER, GLENN C.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Alicia Baturay	2441	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 April 2010.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 03 October 2007 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .                                    |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .                        |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This Office Action is in response to a request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), which was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 06 April 2010 has been entered.
2. Claims 1, 6, 9, 10, 16, 18, 19, 23, and 25 were amended.
3. Claims 1-25 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Amendment***

4. Applicant's amendments and arguments with respect to claims 1-25 filed on 06 April 2010 have been fully considered but they are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.
5. ***Applicant Argues:*** It is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or template to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. It appears that the present rejection reflects an impermissible attempt to use the instant claims as a guide or roadmap in formulating the rejection using impermissible hindsight reconstruction of the invention.

**In Response:** The examiner respectfully submits that in response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Additionally, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

### ***Claim Objections***

6. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: on line 24, Applicant writes "corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs<sub>ss</sub>." It is thought that Applicant meant to delete one of those commas. Appropriate correction is required.

***Specification***

7. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Applicant's claims 6, 16, and 23 cite "the first command associated with a function other than a search function" but the examiner can find no explicit mention of this negative limitation in the specification.

Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate portions of the specification (pages and paragraphs) which dictate the structure on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

8. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: Applicant's claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 cite "purchasing criteria" but the examiner can find no explicit mention of the phrase "purchasing criteria" within the specification.

Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate portions of the specification (pages and paragraphs) which dictate the structure on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 6, 16, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Nowhere in the specification does the phrase “the first command associated with a function other than a search function” appear.

Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977) (“[the] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining.”). See also *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), aff ’d mem., 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. See MPEP § 2173.05(i).

11. Claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to

one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. Nowhere in the specification does the phrase “purchasing criteria” appear.

Any negative limitation or exclusionary proviso must have basis in the original disclosure. If alternative elements are positively recited in the specification, they may be explicitly excluded in the claims. See *In re Johnson*, 558 F.2d 1008, 1019, 194 USPQ 187, 196 (CCPA 1977) (“[the] specification, having described the whole, necessarily described the part remaining.”). See also *Ex parte Grasselli*, 231 USPQ 393 (Bd. App. 1983), aff ’d mem., 738 F.2d 453 (Fed. Cir. 1984). The mere absence of a positive recitation is not basis for an exclusion. Any claim containing a negative limitation which does not have basis in the original disclosure should be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. See MPEP § 2173.05(i).

12. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

13. Claims 6, 16, and 23 recite the limitation “the first command associated with a function other than a search function.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

14. Claims 1, 9, 10, 18, 19, and 25 recite the limitation “purchasing criteria.” There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

15. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

16. Claims 1-3, 5-14, 16-20 and 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Stevenson et al. (U.S. 7,257,585) in view of Baird et al. (U.S. 2002/0188603) in view of Debaty (U.S. 2004/0015484) in view of Skillen et al. (U.S. 6,098,065) and further in view of Anupam et al. (U.S. 6,535,912).

Stevenson teaches the invention substantially as claimed including an embodiment that is an add-on to a browser allowing the browser to augment files “on the fly,” i.e. where the user directs a browser to a resource located on a network, the method analyzes the file as it is opened by the browser, augments the file with appropriate hyperlinks, and displays the augmented file with active hyperlinks. “Clicking on” the hyperlink will redirect the browser to the associated uniform resource locator (see Summary of Invention).

17. With respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, Stevenson teaches a network based system for retrieving information, said system comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line

50), said server system further configured to: enable the user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches display a function menu on said user interface to prompt the user to select a desired function to apply to the selected object; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to produce a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25) the process further including: generate a plurality of universal resource locators (URLs) based on the selected object and the selected function (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); and the result generated by the vendor web server based on the processed object (Baird, page 5, paragraph 43 and page 2, paragraph 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object.

However, Debaty teaches the selected function including a purchasing function associated with a plurality of vendor websites wherein the purchasing function automatically

initiates a purchase of an item using the plurality of vendor web sites and the purchasing criteria, the item associated with the selected object (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20); the plurality of remote vendor web servers housing the plurality of vendor web sites (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36); receive a processing result from each of the vendor web servers (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36); and communicate with a vendor web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Debaty in order to enable the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server in connection therewith (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from each of the plurality of remote vendor web servers at said server system including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary

to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen does not explicitly enabling a user to select purchasing criteria.

However, Anupam teaches to enable a user to select purchasing criteria (Anupam, col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen in view of Anupam in order to enable a user to select purchasing criteria. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the user to automatically go directly to the web page containing the most current listing of items that meet the criteria without having to manually go through intermediate steps (Anupam, col. 5, lines 14-19).

18. With respect to claims 2, 11 and 20 Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10 and 19, including a method further comprising: processing at the client system the at

least one of the resulting web page and other output; and prompting the user to select a command to perform on the resulting web page (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 60-65).

19. With respect to claim 3, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 1, including a method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises selecting an object including at least one of text, a hyperlink, a picture, a sound file, a video file, and any selectable object included within the electronic document (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

20. With respect to claims 5, 12 and 22, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10 and 19, including a method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises utilizing a text-grabbing algorithm to select the object (Stevenson, Figs. 4-7; col. 5, lines 8-34).

21. With respect to claims 6, 16 and 23, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10 and 19, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising: selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises enabling the user to designate first a web site as a target web site for a first function included within the function menu (Baird, page 4, paragraph 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a first command associated with a function other than a search function.

However, Debaty teaches the selected function including a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20); the vendor web server housing the vendor web site (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36) and associate a first command with the first function executable using the first web site, the first command associated with a function other than a search function (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Debaty in order to enable the use of a first command associated with a function other than a search function. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments.

22. With respect to claims 7, 17 and 24, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10 and 19, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising: selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises enabling

the user to customize the function menu by selecting each function included within the function menu (Baird, page 4, paragraph 31).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

23. With respect to claims 8 and 13, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1 and 10, including a method wherein displaying a function menu on the client system further comprises displaying a function menu on the client system by utilizing at least one of a mouse, a keyboard, a track-ball, a joystick, a digitizing pad, a touch screen, a voice activation device, and any input device connected to the client system (Stevenson, col. 5, lines 51-53).

24. With respect to claims 9 and 25, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1 and 19, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising: selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system further comprises: generating a plurality of universal resource locators (URLs) based on the selected object and the selected function (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with each target web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Baird, page 2, paragraph 13); generating a processing result at each of the target web servers by processing the selected object (Baird, page 4, paragraph 33); transmitting the processing results from each of the target web servers to the server system; and processing each of the processing results at the server system before transmitting at least one resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 4, paragraphs 27 and 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object.

However, Debaty teaches the selected function including a purchasing function associated with a plurality of vendor websites wherein the purchasing function automatically initiates a purchase of an item using the plurality of vendor web sites and the purchasing criteria, the item associated with the selected object (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20); the plurality of remote vendor web servers housing the plurality of vendor web sites (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36); receive a processing result from each of the vendor web servers (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36); and communicate with a vendor web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Debaty in order to enable the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server in connection therewith (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from each of the plurality of remote vendor web servers at said server system including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen does not explicitly teach applying the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item.

However, Anupam teaches applying the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item (Anupam, col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen in view of Anupam in order to enable applying the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item. One would be

motivated to do so in order to enable the user to automatically go directly to the web page containing the most current listing of items that meet the criteria without having to manually go through intermediate steps (Anupam, col. 5, lines 14-19).

25. With respect to claim 14, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 10, including a system wherein said client system further comprises at least one of a cell phone, a computer, a personal digital assistant (PDA), and a television (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52).

26. With respect to claim 18, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claim 10, including a method for retrieving information using a server system (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50) coupled to a centralized database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47) and at least one client system (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52), said method comprising: selecting an object from an electronic document displayed on a client system (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches displaying a function menu on the client system to prompt a user to select a desired function; transmitting the selected object and the selected function from the client system to the server system; processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); communicating with a target web server to complete the processing of the selected object; and transmitting at least one of a resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 3, paragraph 27) and a method wherein processing the selected object by applying the selected function at the server

system further comprises: communicating with each target web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Baird, page 2, paragraph 13); generating a processing result at each of the target web servers by processing the selected object (Baird, page 4, paragraph 33); transmitting the results from each of the target web servers to the server system; and processing each of the processing results at the server system before transmitting at least one resulting web page and other output to the client system (Baird, page 4, paragraphs 27 and 34).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application (Baird, page 1, paragraph 5).

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a vendor web server.

However, Debaty teaches communicate with a vendor web server corresponding to each of the plurality of URLs (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20); receive a processing result from each of the vendor web servers (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Debatty in order to enable the use of a vendor web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can

now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server in connection therewith (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a processing result from each of the plurality of remote vendor web servers at said server system including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of each process result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of each processing result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service (Skillen, col. 1, lines 23-37).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen does not explicitly enabling applying the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item.

However, Anupam teaches apply the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item (Anupam, col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen in view of Anupam in order to apply the purchasing criteria to the selected object, wherein the purchase criteria includes considering a purchase price for the item. One would be motivated to do so in order to enable the user to automatically go directly to the web page containing the most current listing of items that meet the criteria without having to manually go through intermediate steps (Anupam, col. 5, lines 14-19).

27. Claims 4, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stevenson in view of Baird in view of Debaty in view of Skillen in view of Anupam and further in view of Bates et al. (U.S. 6,735,347).

28. With respect to claims 4, 15 and 21, Stevenson teaches the invention described in claims 1, 10 and 19, including a network based system for retrieving information, said system comprising: a client system comprising a user interface and a browser (Stevenson, col. 2, lines 45-52); a centralized database for storing information (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 39; col. 4, lines 45-47); and a server system configured to be coupled to said client system and said database (Stevenson, Fig. 2, element 33; col. 4, line 50), said server system further configured to: enable a user to select an object from an electronic document displayed on said user interface (Stevenson, Fig. 7, element 133; col. 5, lines 21-22 and 51-53).

Stevenson does not explicitly teach a user being able to customize the function menu.

However, Baird teaches display a function menu on said user interface to prompt a user to select a desired function to apply to the selected object; receive the selected object and the selected function from said client system; process the selected object by applying the selected function to the selected object to produce a processed object (Baird, page 3, paragraph 25); and the result generated by the vendor web server based on the processed object (Baird, page 5, paragraph 43 and page 2, paragraph 14).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Stevenson in view of Baird in order to enable a user to customize the function menu. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to configure a search tool using the Internet or other network from within an application.

The combination of Stevenson and Baird does not explicitly teach the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object.

However, Debaty teaches the selected function including a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item associated with the selected object (Debaty, Fig. 5; page 3, paragraph 36 and page 4, paragraph 20); the vendor web server housing the vendor web site (Debaty, page 3, paragraph 36).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson and Baird in view of Debatty in order to enable the use of a purchasing function associated with a vendor website wherein the purchasing function initiates a purchase of an item using the vendor web site, the item

associated with the selected object. One would be motivated to do so in order to dramatically enhance the capabilities of the web browser of the client because the user can now simply click on the added URLs to invoke the respective context-aware services within their respective personalized environments.

The combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty does not explicitly teach the use of a server and a web server.

However, Skillen teaches transmit the processed object from said server system to a web server in connection therewith (Skillen, col. 4, lines 30-35); receive a result from the web server at said server system including at least a resulting web page; determine whether further processing of the result is necessary to complete the selected function; and transmit at least one of the result and another output to said client system (Skillen, col. 4, lines 41-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird and Debaty in view of Skillen in order to enable the use of a server and a web server. One would be motivated to do so in order to allow a user to quickly find the relevant information for which the user is looking without leaving the user to his/her own imagination to try to think of all the alternative descriptions of a product or service.

The combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen does not explicitly enabling a user to select purchasing criteria.

However, Anupam teaches to enable a user to select purchasing criteria (Anupam, col. 4, line 56 – col. 5, line 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, and Skillen in view of Anupam in order to enable the user to automatically go directly to the web page containing the most current listing of items that meet the criteria without having to manually go through intermediate steps (Anupam, col. 5, lines 14-19).

The combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, Skillen, and Anupam does not explicitly teach the use of OCR.

However, Bates teaches a method wherein selecting an object from an electronic document further comprises: processing the selected object using optical character recognition (OCR) and extracting text from the selected object using OCR (Bates, col. 5, lines 15-56).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the combination of Stevenson, Baird, Debaty, Skillen, and Anupam in view of Bates in order to enable the use of OCR. One would be motivated to do so in order to convert textual information contained within an image easily and automatically (Bates, col. 5, lines 36-37).

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia Baturay whose telephone number is (571) 272-3981. The examiner can normally be reached at 7:30am - 5pm, Monday - Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wing Chan can be reached on (571) 272-7493. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Alicia Baturay/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2446

December 3, 2010